

## REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in the instant application. In the Office Action, claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over publications No. JP 11-341452 (hereinafter, "Shimizu"), No. JP 09-091869 (hereinafter, "Kato") and No. JP 11-027508 (hereinafter, "Takahashi"). In addition to the reasons already set forth, Applicant notes that the rejection should be reconsidered and withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites an electronic watermark detection device comprising a detection result adjustment means for adjusting a detection interval of an electronic watermark based on a detection result of an electronic watermark detection means. The Office Action alleged that this feature was taught by Shimizu. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In contrast to the claimed invention, Shimizu attempts to improve the reliability of watermark extraction, even when the degree of embedding of the watermark is weakened. Specifically, Shimizu prepares the embedded information as a bit string, changes the sign of this bit string, and embeds the bit string, which has the changed sign, into a frame. Thereafter, Shimizu detects embedded information by comparing the accumulated observation result with a variable threshold value. Therefore, Shimizu does not disclose the point of adjusting a detection interval according to the detection result of an electronic watermark, as recited in the independent claim.

Turning then to Kato, the reference discloses a method for shortening the processing time of a CPU, wherein CPU processing is performed only by detecting that control information has changed. In other words, Kato is related to a method of embedding having a high correlation with picture compression processing by DCT. On the other hand, Takahashi discloses a method of embedding information into digital image data. More specifically, Takahashi is related to a

method of embedding having improved performance of adaptation processing for minimizing image quality degradation. Therefore, both secondary references are clearly distinguished from the watermark detection features recited in the claims of the present application.

Again, as the Office Action extends the rejection of claims 1-10 to encompass claim 21-30 by analogy, the patentable distinction of claim 1 and its dependent claims over the prior art similarly compels that the rejection of all claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims recite patentable subject matter, and kindly solicits an early notice of allowability. If the Examiner has any reservation in allowing the claims, and believes that a telephone interview would advance prosecution, he is kindly requested to telephone the undersigned at his earliest convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,



David J. Torrente  
Registration No. 49,099

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.  
400 Garden City Plaza - Ste. 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343 (Telephone)  
(516) 742-4366 (Facsimile)

DJT:ar